

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS PO. Box 1450 Alexandra, Viginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/768,733	01/24/2001	Per Zeuthen	P/772-283	1229
24998	7590 09/04/2003			
DICKSTEIN SHAPIRO MORIN & OSHINSKY LLP			EXAMINER	
2101 L STREI WASHINGTO	ET NW DN, DC 20037-1526		GRIFFIN, WALTER DEAN	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1764	

DATE MAILED: 09/04/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Advisory Action	09/768,733	ZEUTHEN ET AL.				
Advisory Action	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Walter D. Griffin	1764				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address						
THE REPLY FILED 13 August 2003 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.						
PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]						
 a)						
37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).						
 A Notice of Appeal was filed on <u>13 August 2003</u>. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. 						
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:						
(a) ☐ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);						
(b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);						
(c) they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or						
(d) 🔲 they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.						
NOTE:						
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):						
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).						
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.						
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.						
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) will not be entered or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.						
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:						
Claim(s) allowed:						
Claim(s) objected to:						
Claim(s) rejected:						
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:						
8. The proposed drawing correction filed on is a) approved or b) disapproved by the Examiner.						
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s)						
10. Other:						
		Walter D. D. Griffin Primary Examiner Art Unit: 1764				

}

Application No.

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: the examiner maintains that the Kelley reference does, in fact, disclose the claimed step of cooling the hydrotreated effluent. It is clear that Kelley discloses that the process can be operated without intervening cooling, condensation, or separation of ammonia and hydrogen sulfide. See column 4, lines 26-30. However, Kelley also discloses that an intervening treatment of the hydrofiner effluent can be performed to remove ammonia and hydrogen sulfide. See column 6, lines 25-36. One of ordinary skill in the art reading these two sections would realize that an intervening cooling step can be applied. Additionally, the disclosure that the hydrocracker can be operated at substantially reduced temperatures indicates that cooling can be performed.